REMARKS

I. INTRODUCTION

Claims 1-14 and 35 remain pending in the present application. No new matter has been added. In view of the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable.

II. THE INFORMALITY BASED OBJECTION TO CLAIMS 1 AND 35 SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

The Examiner objected to claims 1 and 35 on the grounds that the recited claim limitations are not clear according to Figs. 2a and 2b (hereinafter collectively referred to as "Fig. 2"). (*See* 10/07/04 Office Action, ¶ 3, p. 2).

Figure 2 represents an exemplary embodiment of the present invention. As such, it is to be regarded in an illustrative rather than a restrictive sense. It is understood that various modifications may be made to the described invention while still conforming to the limitations of the claims.

Claim 1 recites:

> A method for retrieving and presenting data from a target system, comprising:
>
> > (i) receiving target system information from the target system;
>
> > (ii) retrieving a set of object description files corresponding to the target system information;
>
> > (iii) sending to a client a sett of objects supported based on the set of object description files retrieved;

2

(iv) receiving a selected object from the client;

(v) selecting one of the set of object description files corresponding to the selected object;

(vi) retrieving one of a set of data retrieval programs corresponding to the target system information;

(vii) retrieving object data about the selected object using the retrieved one of the set of data retrieval programs;

(viii) decoding the object data about the user selected object using the selected one of the set of object description files corresponding to the selected object to form decoded object data; and

(ix) sending the decoded object data and a presentation format to the client allowing the client to be data driven.

Limitation (i) corresponds to step 206 of Fig. 2., wherein the client instantiates the object interface in order to get object information from the target. (*See* Specification, p. 7, ll. 24-25). Limitaiton (ii) corresponds to step 209, wherein the object interface requests and retrieves from the target information regarding the processor type and the operating system of the target. (*See* Specification, p. 7, l. 26 - p. 8, l. 1). Limitation (iii) of claim 1 corresponds to step 215, wherein the object interface loads the object description files for the specified target operating system from the object database. (*See* Specification, p. 8, ll. 1-4). After the object description files are loaded and successfully validated, the object interface is initilaized. (*Id*). Limitation (iv) of claim 1 corresponds to step 230 of Fig. 2. In this step, the client sends a reference to the object selected to the object interface. (*See* Specification, p. 8, ll. 16-17). Limitation (vi) corresponds to step 233, wherein the object interface accesses the object database to retrieve the object description corresponding to the selected object. (*See*

3

Specification, p. 8, ll. 17-23). In the embodiment of the present invention represented by Fig. 2, the object interface also at this time retrieves from the object database the Gopher program corresponding to the processor of the target. (*Id.*). Limitation (vii) corresponds to step 239, wherein the object interface retrieves specified object data from the target. (*See* Specification, p. 8, ll. 24-27). Limitation (viii) corresponds to step 242, wherein the object interface decodes the data returned from the target based on the object description retrieved from the object database. (*See* Specification, p. 9, ll. 1-2). Limitation (ix) corresponds to step 245, wherein the object interface sends the decoded data to the client along with a presentation format. (*See* Specification, p. 9, ll. 2-4).

Claim 35 recites substantially the same limitations as claim 1. Applicants submit that the steps identified in Figure 2 as corresponding to the limitations of claim 1 may also be seen to correspond to those limitations of claim 35. As the limitations of claims 1 and 35 have been explained with respect to the flowchart presented in Figure 2, Applicants respectfully request that the objections to claim 1 and 35 be withdrawn.

III.   THE 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) REJECTIONS SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

Claims 1-14 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,263,344 to Wu et al. ("the Wu reference").

The Wu reference relates to a method for decoding codes describing hypertext objects in an intermediate language on a device with minimal computing power and resources. (*See* Wu, col. 1, ll. 31-37). The intermediate language may be generated from object specifying languages such as HTML and JAVA. (*See* Wu, col. 2, ll. 11-13). The codes in the intermediate

4

language are decoded and processed to generate a screen of information displaying selections for the user. (*See* Wu, col. 1, ll. 14-16). The file corresponding to the chosen selection is retrieved, decoded, processed, and displayed to the user again for selection. (*See* Wu, col. 1, ll. 16-18). This may be implemented in order to play a CD, DVD, or other type of media format, while performing a variety of other functions and utilizing minimal computing power. (*See* Wu, col. 1, ll. 23-43).

The invention of the present application relates to a method and system for retrieving and presenting data from a target system. As a client selects an object, one of the data retrieval programs corresponding to the target system is used to retrieve object data from the target system for that object. The client is then provided with the object data and a presentation format, which are based upon one of the object description files corresponding to the selected object.

Claim 1 recites "retrieving *a set of object description files corresponding to the target system information*." The Examiner contends that this limitation is anticipated by the step of identifying and flagging the position of a file, i.e. an HTML file, from which the file is to be retrieved, as disclosed in the Wu reference. (*See* 10/07/04 Office Action, ¶ 4, p. 3). The Examiner appears to be equating a set of object description files which correspond to the target system information to the types of files which are utilized in the Wu reference, i.e. HTML and JAVA files. (*See generally* Wu reference). In contrast, the file retrieved in the present application describes the target system's implementation of the object, and is specific to the implementation of the object by the operating system running on the target system. (*See* Specification, p. 2, ll. 11-20). Retrieval of this file allows the host to gather information about

5

the objects running on the target. (*Id.*). As would be understood by one of skill in the art, this is fundamentally distinct from merely identifying and flagging the position of a data file.

Further, claim 1 recites "sending to a client *a set of objects supported based on the set of object description files retrieved.*" The Examiner contends that this limitation is anticipated by the Wu reference, which discloses displaying to the user the content of a default homepage file. (*See* 10/07/04 Office Action, ¶ 4, p. 3). As illustrated in an exemplary embodiment of the present invention, the object database loads object descriptions for the operating system from the object database. (*See* Specification, p. 10, ll. 3-4). The object browser then enumerates all object types supported by the object interface using the object descriptions obtained from the object database. (*See* Specification, p. 10, ll. 4-6). This process is notably distinct from that which is disclosed in the Wu reference. A content of a web page may comprise any combination of text, graphics, or other information. Displaying this content to a user portrays a viewable image, which the user may read before taking further action. However, the set of objects supported as described in claim 1 may include protection domains, memory partitions, tasks, semaphores, message queues, watchdogs, page managers, page pools, virtual memory contexts, file descriptors, and modules. (*See* Specification, p. 10, ll. 22-26). Further, these objects are sent to a client, which is an application that runs on a computer and relies on a server to perform some operations. Conversely, the Wu reference discloses portrayal of the viewable image to a user.

Claim 1 also recites "selecting one of the set of object description files corresponding to the selected object; retrieving *one of a set of data retrieval programs corresponding to the target system information*; retrieving object data about the selected object

6

using the retrieved one of the set of data retrieval programs." The Examiner contends that

these limitations are anticipated by the Wu reference disclosure of receiving infrared code,

which represents a user request, and then performing the request. (*See* 10/07/04 Office Action,

¶ 4, p. 3). For example, "[i]f an infrared code representing the play function is received, the

highlighted selection on the screen will be retrieved and played." (Wu reference, col. 11, ll. 10-

12). In contrast, the object which is being retrieved in the present application is not a user

selection or a web page. The present application teaches retrieval of one of a set of data

retrieval programs corresponding to the target system information. This data retrieval program

is then used to retrieve object data about the selected object. Specifically, the object interface

accesses the target to retrieve the attributes of the selected object running on the target by

sending the retrieval program through the target interface to the target. (*See* Specification, p.

10, ll. 13-15). This process differs substantially from retrieving a song from a playlist or a web

page as disclosed in the Wu reference, which merely retrieves a set of stored data to satisfy a

user request as opposed to retrieving a data retrieval program which corresponds to the target

system information.

Lastly, claim 1 recites "sending the decoded object data and a presentation

format to the client allowing the client to be data driven." The Wu reference discloses a looped

process whereby a user supplied input code is retrieved, processes are executed to handle these

inputs, and either the process returns a command or it loops back to the step of retrieving user

input. (*See* Wu reference, col. 9, ll. 1-11). An example of a command returned by the process

is "GO_HOME" which would return the user to a home web page. (*Id.*). The Examiner

contends that this disclosure anticipates the above identified limitation of claim 1. However,

7

the return of a command which leads a user to a web page is not equivalent to sending decoded object data and a presentation format to a client. In the present invention, the client uses the set of object attributes which was returned as a result of the original request. (*See* Specification, p. 9, ll. 7-11). Such uses may include displaying the object's attributes in a format suitable for a graphical user interface. (*Id.*). This process is not taught or suggested by the Wu reference.

It is respectfully submitted that for at least the reasons discussed above, the Wu reference does not anticipate the limitations of claim 1. As claims 2-14 depend from and therefore include all the limitations of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable. Therefore, Applicants request that rejection of claims 1-14 be withdrawn.

Claim 35 was rejected on the same grounds as claim 1. (*See* 10/07/04 Office Action, ¶ 4, pp. 2-3). Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that this claim should also be allowed for at least the reasons discussed above with regard to claim 1. As such, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 35 be withdrawn.

8

IV. CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the now pending claims are in condition for allowance. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 7, 2005

By:_____

Michael J. Marcin (Reg. No. 48,198)

Fay Kaplun & Marcin, LLP
150 Broadway, Suite 702
New York, NY 10038

9